DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 588 HE 007 109

AUTHOR Ploch, Donald R.
TITLE Higher Education: Faculty as Professionalization and Change Agents. Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO 0-0335
PUB DATE Jun 72
GRANT OEG-0-70-2918(508)
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; Church Role; Curriculum Development; *Faculty; *Higher Education; Professional Education; *Socialization; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; Teacher Influence; *Theological Education

ABSTRACT

Why do people, who have charge of socialization processes, arrange them the way they do? This contrasts with the question typically asked: "What does the person being socialized have to do to succeed?" It shifts the focus of attention from children or students to parents or faculty. In this research the focus is on theological faculty. The sample consists of 269 faculty teaching at 15 theological schools. Fifteen of 33 schools were chosen and stratified by university affiliation and denomination. There were 389 full-time faculty at the rank of assistant professor or above who were the universe sampled. A representative sample of 269 (69 percent) were chosen as respondents. Research consisted of visiting each school for a week, interviewing faculty, talking informally with students, and researching the history of the school in the library. Interviews focused on and covered these areas: personal background, major curricula shifts since 1960, students, faculty colleagues, career development, intellectual context, and future of the church. Findings and conclusions are: (1) the schools are more alike than different; (2) since there is no vision of theological education that commands widespread respect and authority, changes occuring in format, teaching technique, and student freedom are based on a system of trial and error; (3) schools are less than 3 percent female or black; and (4) theological language, in its traditional sense, is used very little. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116588

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 0-0335
Grant No. OEG-0-70-2918(508)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HIGHER EDUCATION: FACULTY AS PROFESSIONALIZATION AND CHANGE AGENTS

Donald R. Ploch
Yale University
New Haven, Conn. 06520

June 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

HE 007 109

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 0-0335
Grant No. OEG-0-70-2918(508)

HIGHER EDUCATION: FACULTY AS PROFESSIONALIZATION AND CHANGE AGENTS

Donald R. Ploch

Yale University

New Haven, Conn. 06520

February 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	5
METHODS	8
FINDINGS	
Similarities	13
Fifteen Different Schools	19
Summary of Interview Data	29
REFERENCES	41
APPENDIX A	
Focused Interview for Research	42
APPENDIX B	
Detailed Tables	44
APPENDIX C	
Curriculum Content Categories	48
TABLE 1	11
Total Faculty, Number Interviewed, and Percent Interviewed Within Denominational Group and Type of Institution	
TABLE 2	14
Number and Percent of Faculty and Interviewees By Denomination and Subject Area	
TABLE 3	16
Number and Percent of Faculty and Interviewees By University Affiliation of School and Subject Area	

SUMMARY

The central problem of the research is socialization and the central question addressed is: Why do people, who have charge of socialization processes, arrange them the way they do? This contrasts with the question typically asked: What does the person being socialized have to do to succeed? It shifts the focus of attention from children or students to parents or faculty. In this research the focus is on theological faculty.

The sample consists of 269 faculty teaching at 15 theological schools. The schools were chosen from Methodist, United Presbyterian, United Church of Christ and non-denominational schools fully accredited by the American Association of Theological Schools (AATS). Fifteen of 33 schools were chosen and stratified by university affiliation (university school, university affiliate, independent) and denomination. There were 389 full time faculty at the rank assistant professor or above who were the universe to be sampled. A representative sample of 269 (69%) were chosen as respondents. There were only 6 refusals.

Research consisted of visiting each school for a week, interviewing faculty, talking informally with students, and researching the history of the school in the library. Interviews lasted about 50 minutes. They were focused and covered these areas: personal background, major curricular shifts since 1960, students, faculty colleagues, career development, intellectual context, future of the church.

Findings and conclusions can be briefly summarized:

1. The schools are more alike than different. Curricula follow similar patterns and resources are allocated in the same way. Neither denomination nor university affiliation makes much difference.

2. Despite this uniformity, which rests on past practices, there is no vision of theological education which commands widespread respect and authority. Curricula are individualized, tailor made for each student. There is no consensus about the meaning of the M.Div. or B.D. degrees; no one can guarantee the quality or quantity of a student's knowledge on graduation unless he consults that student's records or knows him personally. The future of school and church is largely not reflected on. There is no common vision. Thus though there is unease with the present curriculum there is no clear cut solution. Changes are in format, teaching technique, student freedom but not in basic content; moreover, the basic system for change is trial and error.

3. The schools are WASP preserves less than 3% female or black. The intellectual context is also white male. Change may be very slow in this area.

4. Theological language, in its traditional sense, is used very little. Though one strong strand of Biblical scholarship sees God as the God of history, theological faculty can discuss their own lives, the history of their seminaries, their students and faculty colleagues without recourse to this notion. Understanding is couched in phrases taken from sociology and psychology. Theological language is reserved as a rhetoric for the church.

INTRODUCTION

Although the research is set in the context of adult socialization, it is also a quite conscious attempt to draw several strands of sociological research together as well as exploit specific factors in my own background. In elaborating the theoretical context of the research I'll begin by detailing the ways in which it grows out of my own background. I have chosen this course because I am firmly convinced both that all good research exploits the life history of the researcher and that it is peculiar constellations of events in a researcher's life that lead to the framing of problems for research. Stated more formally and less personally: all of sociological research is framed and carried out in a specific socio-historical location. Further, that location is crucial to understand fully the research. Thus I begin by spelling out the socio-historic location of this research.

My own career lead from an undergraduate degree in chemistry to a degree in theology which was followed by five years of service as a campus chaplain for The Methodist Church (now the United Methodist Church). It was during this period as a professional religious worker that I first began to reflect on my own theological training over against the expectations of my church employers. We were enough at cross purposes that I chose to leave the employ of the church and return to graduate study.

Sociology was appealing because I began to sense that neither my church employers nor my seminary faculty really understood the social matrix in which people and clergy existed. Theological judgments were constantly made, but without much appreciation of life as it was taken for granted. My concern was to equip myself with the ability to read, criticize, and perform sociological research to better understand the social matrix in which we live and to better understand the mismatch between what the church requires of its adherents and what the world requires of them. In short I wanted to stand within both theological and sociological traditions, to be able to use each to illuminate the other. In this particular case sociological interests dictate the context in which the research occurs and theological interests dictate the specific site.

I had been reading adult socialization literature for a semester when it dawned on me that the bulk of all socialization literature addresses the question: What does the person being socialized have to do to be successful? Specifically, this means that childhood socialization concentrates on the child with only peripheral attention to the parents. Studies of adult socialization tend to concentrate on students (e.g. Boys in White) with only peripheral attention to faculty. The literature ignored people who were nominally in charge of socialization procedures. It failed to direct attention to the question: Why do those in charge set the process up the way they do?

This question became the central focus of the research. The next task was to choose a research site. Theological education was chosen for these reasons: 1) It is a particularly intense secondary

socialization experience. Several commentators (e.g. Berger; Holmer) have commented on the intensity of the process. In brief the argument is that in becoming a religious professional a person must master more than a body of information. He must become someone. As Berger puts it: he must get used to looking in the mirror and seeing his face floating over a clerical collar. He becomes a minister (priest or rabbi), and in doing so is an embodyment of the religious tradition. Like it or not he becomes an exemplar. Only medical education is as intense in the character formation of its students. But there the social role is better defined. It is easier to know when to be and when not to be a physician. Clergy roles are more diffuse. In a social system in which most professional roles are becoming more specific and universalistic the religious professional is one of the last to be defined as diffuse and particularistic. While other professions are tending rapidly to define professional roles in such a way that limits are known and set and in such a way that anyone with specific competencies (normally certified by eduation or licensing) can fill them; clergy roles are still open to the widest possible definitions. This is part of the reason for current debates about specialist or generalist clergy. In addition criteria for choosing incumbents is not always universalistic. One needs more than educational credentials or licensing; one needs a calling - a certain winsomeness - a special extra. However ill-defined this extra is, it is apparent that it is not available to all men. Many may answer the call but few are chosen.

2) Given the traditions of American higher education, it seemed reasonable both that the faculty would be in charge of theological education and that they would be reflective of what they were doing. Whether they are the only persons in charge is debatable. In most cases that I looked at, however, faculty had final say about educational aspects of the program. Curriculum construction was their province.

The assumption that they would be reflective of what they were doing had two sources. They were teachers. It seemed reasonable to assume that they would be reflective about their teaching. The process was rational and calculated. In this sense practically all formal education differs from childhood socialization. There is little evidence that the bulk of parents approach their responsibility as socializing agents with calculated rationality. On the other hand teachers are engaged in a rational process and can be expected to be able to discuss it with ease. Given the quantity of their responses the assumption that they could and would discuss their work was well founded.

3) The final reason for the choice of sites was to exploit my own background. Since I was graduated from a theological seminary, I knew I could use my previous experience to further the research aims. I could follow the conversations of the faculty and would still be current enough in the field to be able to distinguish references to other scholars both currently active and historically important. My training and short ministerial career would provide a basis for rapport.

Having decided on the central focus and the site for the research, I was able to integrate several subsidiary issues into the design. First of these was the temporal dimension and how it affected the

faculty's role as socializers. The major piece of research that bears on this topic is The Changing American Parent, Miller and Swanson. It is their thesis that parents raise children according to the parents' present and anticipated future social locations rather than in accordance with their own upbringing. Put another way, within the temporal dimension present and anticipated future were more important than the past. Rather than state hypotheses about the relative influence of various temporal references, I decided to try to assess the relative power of these inputs. Thus in addition to probing the past training and experience of the faculty, I also asked about their present plans, future projects, and their expectations for the future of the ministry. With this set of data I hoped to be able to evaluate the effect of present location, anticipated future, and past experiences in a fashion that would link up with Miller and Swanson's study, the work of Wendell Bell and his associates on the sociology of the future, and psychological learning theories.

It also was important to examine the sources of faculty perceptions. When they think about the present situation and future possibilities for the local church, do they get data from their own experience as pastors? Do they look to empirical studies of local church life? Do they read imaginative and/or normative studies about church life? An exhaustive list is endless but the continua are clear. One of them has to do with actual experience vs. cognitive assessment of data. It is a theory-practice continuum. Another has to do with the normative component. At one end there is the "value free" collection and explanation of data; at the other the collection and explanation of data within an obvious normative context. In other words from telling it like it is about the church to telling it like it ought to be. Given that the subjects were religious academics I assumed that theoretical-normative concerns would dominate.

The feedback loop from students was also a subsidiary focus. At an earlier point in time theological education, as the rest of higher education, was routinized and authoritarian. Curricula changed very little and the basic teaching technique was lecture and recitation. The student was more processed than listened to. As late as 1965 in a pilot study, which preceded this study, I found that student feedback consisted almost entirely of faculty evaluation of their progress. Students influenced the socialization process - in this case the curriculum, because they came to the institution with different abilities and different backgrounds. Flexibility was brought into the curriculum because not all students would tolerate the same track. There was little evidence, at that time and place, that students would be effectively franchised to influence curriculum decisions.

Diffusion of innovation was another focus. There were several agents to consider. One popular model is built on a trickle-down effect where innovations are made by leading institutions and then trickle-down through the prestige hierarchy. Aside from the fact that this presumes a uniform prestige hierarchy that may not exist, it is still one alternative among many. A major alternative is that innovation follows personnel shifts. If this is true, it is closely linked to hiring practices. Further the school that trains the largest number of teachers will be the most innovative. A third possibility would be imitation of successful innovation in other fields. If this is the case, then those schools with

the greatest contacts with other professional schools would be the most innovative. For this illustration a final source of innovation could be the American Association of Theological Schools (AATS). If this were true, powerful institutions within AATS would be most innovative. These do not exhaust the possibilities. Further, there is no reason to accept one to the exclusion of others. The most logical procedure was to try to determine the source of innovation.

As educational institutions, theological seminaries would be expected to be influenced by trends in American higher education. It is fair to assume that the closer the ties to a major university, the more educational trends would effect seminaries.

In general the research strategy was to approach the problem as virgin territory. It was important to get a range of variation in socializing procedures but to keep this range in manageable limits. Then one needed to determine what the salient aspects of variation were and what the concomitants or causes of those variations were.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

First, one is impressed with the conservative bias of theological education. It is only when one studies social processes that one is impressed with the sheer inertia of human society. Even the most innovative programs retain major - if not dominant - elements of the past. Changes are more frequently peripheral, matters of kind of examination and distribution of hours, than central, changing content of courses or the elimination of departments. Stability of curricula over time is remarkable.

Second, the future of seminary, ministry and church is largely unknown and in many cases not a subject of serious thought. It is clear that there is no dominant vision across all schools. Some schools have a majority view that sets a climate of opinion but they are few in number. For most faculty the future is unknown and not much thought of outside the notion that it will be pretty much the same as today.

Third, not knowing the future makes it difficult to chart a course and this influences one's sense of identity. Most institutions are unclear about their task and purpose. They no longer train students for "the ministry" but for "ministry." Dropping the article is significant witness that the day of training men for parish ministries and a few other well defined roles (chaplaincies, teaching, etc.) is past. For good or ill graduates enter a variety of occupations.

Fourth, the failure of identification is all pervasive. Where there is no future, there is no past. The present is opaque with experience that has no reference. From whence have we come? and Wither shall we go? are unanswered questions that make it difficult, if not impossible, to apprehend the present. Events continue but they do not cumulate as a history. This can be seen in the inability of schools

to control offerings and requirements in Bible and Church History. There is no synoptic vision. One is reminded of the catalog of a museum of valuable relics. Each was important in its own day and may be today, but neither museum keepers nor visitors know which is which. Thus all are viewed as equal. Similarly one sees the history of the Christian movement from Abraham to 1972 as a succession of events that do not constitute a history. There is no sense of purpose that values some events more than others.

This is not to say that all individuals are without a sense of historic identity. Rather there is no compelling pattern overall. Individuals are conceded their opinions, but there is no normative consensus.

Fifth, the concept of graduate education as training in academic research predominates. The one profession all teachers know is that of teaching. Whether or not they are good teachers is immaterial. If they have been in the business long they know what it takes to succeed. Academic research and scholarly productivity are important. Because scholarship is still a fairly well defined task and because these men know the profession of scholarship better than any other, they tend to teach students to be scholars. Other considerations are secondary.

Sixth, students are coming to effect the process of socialization because they are beginning to have voting power in decisions. There is still a feeling that faculty know better than students what ought to be taught and learned. There is more willingness to argue this out with students rather than pull rank. There are still places where students are disturbed because they feel they have no voice. There are other places where faculty are disturbed because students don't exercise the power they have. The effect that students will have is still unknown because their entry into positions of power is both recent and still growing.

Seventh, most decisions concerning curricula are political in the sense that they are subject either to votes or discussion to reach consensus. In many cases the faculty is openly politicized with well defined coalitions. In others the politicization is less intense and coalitions shift. In either case a decision to alter curriculum is a decision to alter the allocation of scarce resources. It is impossible to determine the meaning of curriculum changes apart from the power of the personnel involved.

Eighth, the future of God-talk is very dim. By and large faculty discuss their own careers and lives, other faculty, students, the history of the seminary, and the future of the church without recourse to theological language. Very few feel "called;" most went through graduate school preparing for an occupation as any other student. Few place high priority on the faith of other colleagues or students. Most interpret the world they experience in secular, social scientific, terms rather than theological-normative ones. As an illustration of the lack of obvious religious content in their conversation, consider this story.

My secretary had transcribed several tapes from four or five seminaries when she asked: "Are you sure these guys teach at theological schools?"

"Sure. Why do you ask?"

"They never mention God."

The absence of traditional religious language is so pervasive that those few who do use it stand out.

Ninth, changes in curricula tend to shift the time burden from students to faculty or at least tend to increase the amount of faculty time devoted to administering the program. I do not mean a net increase in deans or other administrative personnel but an increase in the amount of time that all persons and every person must devote to administration. To adopt a graduate model and to develop student centered education is to personalize education. The limiting case is a program tailor made for each individual. While this can be managed in a graduate faculty that processes a handful of dissertations per year, it can be disastrous for a faculty that must clear 100 students for graduation.

In sum the faculty are in a situation of anomie because there are no generally agreed on norms to legitimate the content of the curriculum as a whole. Without these norms there is a crisis of identity and an inability to grasp the future or structure the past. The predominant response is to structure the situation in terms of academic scholarship. But given the content of the religious tradition with which they deal, this narrow identification is unsatisfactory. There is constant shifting to find a better way.

These findings do not apply to many individuals. But they do apply to collectivities. The reason is that individuals have solved problems of anomie in different ways so that there is no consensus at the level of collectivities.

METHODS

The first decision in the research design was the definition of the sample. It was decided to strive for diversity of types of institutions but not denominations. At the start of the project it was unclear how much research money would be available.[1] Since it was desirable to compare institutions within types, I chose to work with denominations that were essentially homogeneous theologically. Methodist, United Church of Christ, Presbyterian, and non-denominational schools were chosen. They are not only similar to each other theologically; they are also the numerical strength of the liberal center of American Protestantism (cf. Stark and Glock, American Piety). This decision meant that churches from the "left wing" of the Reformation (e.g. Baptist) were ignored. It also meant that liturgical and state churches (e.g. Episcopal, Roman Catholic, and Lutheran) were ignored. At the time the sample was drawn my rationale was that if I strove for both theological and educational diversity, I would have less than one school at each intersection. Some relevant combinations would have to go begging. That being the case it would be extremely difficult to distinguish effect of type of school from denomination. I chose to keep denominations similar so that I could aggregate them to talk about differences between church affiliated schools and non-affiliated ones.

Educationally the schools were to vary with respect to university affiliation: part of a large university, working affiliation with a near-by university, independent school. Examples, from schools not necessarily in the sample, would be Yale Divinity School, Union Theological Seminary in New York (with affiliation to Columbia University), and the Hartford Seminary Foundation.

The universe for the sample consisted of all accredited Methodist, United Church of Christ, United Presbyterian, and non-denominational schools of theology in the AATS Directory of Theological Schools, 1968. Schools with multiple denominational affiliation were dropped. This left 33 schools in the universe: 12 Methodist, 6 United Presbyterian, 4 United Church of Christ, and 11 non-denominational. Three were drawn from each sample by use of a random number table and checked to see if they matched the educational spread. Both the Methodist and non-denominational schools did. United Church of Christ schools did not because there are no university schools. Chicago Theological School has a working relationship with the University of Chicago but is not part of that university. The three schools chosen were retained even though the design criterion was not met. At the time, I assumed the United Presbyterian schools met the criterion. After I was committed to the research, I discovered they did not. I added one more United Presbyterian school to secure complete variation on university affiliation. The sample now consisted of 13 schools all in the industrial

---

[1] This grant was funded after the project was underway. Thus basic design was set hoping for these funds but allowing for the chance they would not be forthcoming.

northeast and north central U.S. A line from Washington D.C. to St. Louis to Minneapolis would set geographical limits to the sample.

At the start of the project I chose to retain the three non-denominational schools and as many denominational schools as I could given limited resources. When this grant was funded it was possible to retain the full design and to add 2 more schools. Both of these were southern and one was predominantly Black. The final sample consisted of 15 schools: 4 Methodist, 4 United Presbyterian, 3 United Church of Christ, and 4 inter- or nondenominational. By institutional affiliation there were: 4 university schools, 4 university affiliates, and 7 independent schools. Thus for the total sample the sampling fraction was 15/33 or 45 percent.

Having defined a sample of theological schools the next task involved definition of a suitable dependent variable and data gathering techniques. I chose the catalogue statement of the curriculum as the best single indicator of the socialization process. It is generally controlled by the faculty and represents the best statement of the current position of the faculty with respect to what is important in the socialization of students. The pattern of required courses and examinations set the tone and often the temporal and spatial flow of student life. Massive changes in the kinds of courses required, or the reshuffling of departments indicate changes in the way students will be processed.

In addition this statement is publicly available. All institutions maintain library and/or archive files of catalogues. It is possible to survey the history of curriculum development through the published catalogues. These catalogues also contain rather complete statements of purpose and descriptions of requirements for entrance and degrees. Changes in these elements also indicate changes in the socialization process.

Thus one data gathering technique was an analysis of curriculum issues of the catalogue. This showed changes in curriculum and in statements of purpose, etc.

To answer the central research question would involve verifying that these catalogue shifts were indicators of change in the socialization process and attempting to find out why these changes occurred. Both of these tasks required interviews with the faculty. Since I also wanted to get an adequate picture of the intellectual context in which faculty moved, I chose to interview as diverse a group of faculty as possible. The plan was to visit an institution for one week. During that week I would interview as many faculty members as possible. Where I couldn't interview all members of the faculty, I would try to sample so that all ranks, ages, and departments were represented. I also used reputational techniques to determine the more influential members of the faculty. If possible these men were interviewed.

Each interview lasted about one hour. All interviews were focused; there were no fixed questions. A sketch of the interview format is presented in Appendix A. Basically I got background information and then discussed some elements of the respondent's career. This was

followed by a long section on curriculum change and other significant change in the socialization process. This generally lead to discussion of students and degrees then faculty colleagues. The interview closed with another section about the respondent, this time concentrating on his intellectual life and career. All interviews were conducted with a tape recorder. Later they were coded from the tapes and relevant sections transcribed for quotation.

During the course of the project I recorded 269 interviews from a pool of 389 full-time faculty of rank assistant professor or higher. The percent of the faculty at any institution who were interviewed varied from a high of 100% to a low of 41%. Total faculty, number and percent interviewed are listed in Table 1. More detailed tables which

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

lists faculty by teaching area are given in Appendix B. The first list numbers interviewed and total faculty; the second percent interviewed.

On the whole, samples are large enough fractions of the faculties that I do not think results are biased. They are not random but are representative. I recorded only six refusals: 4 because they were not interested in the project, the others due to time pressures. On the whole, rapport was good to excellent. I was able to guide the conversation to areas of my own concern without seeming to force the respondent. For the most part I am confident that my data are good.

In every case there were faculty or administrators who were out of town on business or on leave. These cases were distributed throughout the sample. I assume they do not cause bias.

I tried to confine interviewing to the working day and to interview men in their own offices. There were occasions when I interviewed men after the evening meal. In two seminaries I interviewed most men in an office set aside for me. These variations of procedure did not seem to bias my results.

Evenings, meal times, and time not spent interviewing was spent socializing with students and faculty and in the library. I tried to use this time to get a "feel" for the institution. So far as I could tell, I was as successful as I could expect to be in one week. This is not adequate field time but is better than no time at all.

In sum the basic data collecting device was a personal interview conducted with a representative sample of faculty from a sample of seminaries stratified by denomination and institutional type. Background for the interview was secured by reading the curriculum issues of the seminary catalogue. Further information was gleaned from field experience and from other library sources.

It is clear that this sample is not a probability sample from any known population. It is representative of the liberal-center establishment of American Protestantism. Geographically it is confined to the Northeast and Central United States but I am confident that the findings

TABLE 1

Total Faculty, Number Interviewed, and Percent Interviewed Within Denominational Group and Type of Institution

Type of School		Denominational Affiliation 1	2	3	4	Total
University School	Faculty	30	64	20		114
	# Interviewed	18	47	16		81
	% Interviewed	60	73	80		71
University Affiliate	Faculty	51	32	33	17	133
	# Interviewed	21	24	25	16	86
	% Interviewed	41	75	76	94	65
Independent	Faculty	27	22	65	28	142
	# Interviewed	22	17	41	22	102
	% Interviewed	81	77	63	79	72
Total	Faculty	108	118	118	45	389
	# Interviewed	61	78	82	38	269
	% Interviewed	56	66	69	84	69

are applicable outside this area. The denominational boundaries are more important. The findings are not applicable to the evangelical or more conservative Protestant denominations nor to the liturgical churches, including the Roman Catholic. I caution the reader: if any school of theology is different from the sample as defined above, do not expect the findings to hold for it. I should be surprised if other schools are totally different. At the same time effects may be weaker in some schools and stronger in others.

FINDINGS

Similarities

Before sketching differences between institutions it is well to look at Tables 2 and 3 and note the overwhelming similarities in distribution of faculty. The totals for each denomination and each type of university affiliation are the best indicators. Detailed Tables in Appendix B that list schools by denomination and university affiliation have such small numbers that a shift of one or two positions is magnified by shifts of 2 to 7 percentage points.

First examine Table 2. The remarkable consistency is broken at 3 points. Denomination 3 devotes a large proportion of its resources to maintaining instructors in the Biblical Field.[2] It also devotes less of its resources to ancillary positions. The picture that emerges is one of more concern for the classical substance of theology and less for the bridge disciplines such as sociology of religion. This picture is consonant with the image that comes from other studies (e.g. Stark and Glock) which show this denomination to be slightly less liberal than the others with respect to several measures of belief and practice.

---

[2] A more detailed statement of allocation to fields will be found in Appendix C. For the present they can be defined as:

Biblical	- Old and New Testament, English Bible, Biblical Languages, Biblical Theology, Biblical Archeology.
Church History	- Church History, Historical Theology, Missions, Ecumenics.
Theology	- Systematic Theology, Doctrine, Ethics.
Practical	- Homiletics, Christian Education, Counselling, Parish Administration.
Ancillary	- Sociology of Religion, Philosophy of Religion, Psychology of Religion, Speech, Drama

The principal problem with this classification scheme is the allocation of personnel and courses to the Ancillary category. Wherever the content was avowedly in another field, e.g. New Testament Theology, but the method or title was Ancillary, e.g. Biblical Greek, the appointment (and later the course) was coded in the other field (in this case Bible). If the content was only incidentally in another field, e.g. New Testament, but the method or title was Ancillary, e.g. Beginning Greek; then it was coded Ancillary.

This method of coding lead me to see that a good bit of the teaching done in seminaries is ancillary to their main concerns. A little reflection will verify this. Most Biblical languages are taught because they are not taught anywhere else. Would that students came equipped with Greek, Hebrew, Sociology, Psychology, Philosophy, etc. In so far as they are deficient, the seminary must teach these courses as a prolegomena to

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Faculty and Interviewees
By Denomination and Subject Area

Subject Area	Denominational Affiliation 1		2		3		4	
	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]
Bible	8	18	19	20	22	27	7	8
Church History	10	15	12	14	15	18	5	5
Theology	11	17	13	17	10	18	4	6
Practical	21	34	25	35	24	39	13	16
Ancillary	11	24	19	32	11	16	9	10
Total	61	108	88	118	82	118	38	45
	Percent							
Bible	13	17	22	17	27	23	18	18
Church History	16	14	14	12	18	15	13	11
Theology	18	16	15	14	12	15	11	13
Practical	34	31	28	30	29	33	34	35
Ancillary	18	22	22	27	13	14	23	22
Total[c]	99	100	101	100	99	100	99	99

a Interviewed
b Total Full Time Faculty at Rank of Assistant Professor or Higher
c Totals other than 100 are due to rounding error

Denomination 2 has slightly more of its personnel in the ancillary field. This may be a case where there is difficulty distinguishing ancillary and practical. If percentages for ancillary and practical are added, then Denomination 2 is like 1 and 4. Only 3 remains deviant, and that only slight.

From a standpoint of allocation of personnel to full time teaching positions none of the denominational traditions is markedly different from the others.

Table 3 which compares schools by university affiliation tells the same story. Basically, type of university affiliation does not alter the allocation of personnel to teaching position. There are slight differences in areas one might expect. The university schools have more ancillary personnel and less practical. Where in a university school one would find a professor of psychology of religion in an independent school one would find a professor of pastoral counselling. The difference is more than name. In the first case the incumbent is a psychologist (often with joint appointment in a psychology department) who studies religion from the standpoint of psychology. In the second the incumbent will have training in psychology but will see his task as that of teaching students to use psychology (at least its techniques) as part of their pastoral skills.

But even this illustration exaggerates. Add the percentages for practical and ancillary. There is no trend for the combined fields. What little trend there is within the fields is something we would expect, for much of the ancillary category is the secular academic side of the practical field.

The conclusion from both Tables is that these seminaries are more alike than different. If they prove otherwise, it will be due to factors other than the allocation of personnel to teaching positions.

The institutions are alike in another way. Of the 15, only 6 were not involved in a search for new administrative personnel. All others were seeking a new dean, president or both. Of the 6, one had just hired a new dean and one was at a university where there was a search for a new president. Of the institutions searching for new personnel, 3 were replacing men who retired due to age, 4 were replacing men who left to take pastoral positions (they were leaving theological education), the remaining 2 were replacing men who had taken bureaucratic positions in the church or were seeking administrative jobs at other seminaries. All of this is evidence both of instability at the highest administrative levels and the difficulty of attracting good men to these positions.

---

[2] (continued) theology if not as a part of it.

Thus, historically a major influence on seminary curricula has been the changing curricula of undergraduate schools. In this sense some of the changes in theological curricula have occurred to maintain the viability of 18th and 19th century versions of theological scholarship.

TABLE 3

Number and Percent of Faculty and Interviewees By University Affiliation of School and Subject Area

Subject Area	University Affiliation							
	University School		University Affiliate		Independent		Total	
	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]
Bible	18	19	18	25	20	29	56	73
Church History	14	18	12	14	16	20	42	52
Theology	13	19	13	19	12	20	38	58
Practical	22	27	26	46	35	51	83	124
Ancillary	14	31	17	29	19	22	50	82
Total	81	114	86	133	102	142	269	389
	Percent							
Bible	22	17	21	19	20	20	20	19
Church History	17	16	14	11	16	14	16	13
Theology	16	17	15	14	12	14	14	15
Practical	27	24	30	35	34	36	31	32
Ancillary	17	27	20	22	19	15	19	21
Total[c]	99	101	100	101	101	99	100	100

a Interviewed
b Total Full Time Faculty at Rank of Assistant Professor or Higher
c Totals other than 100 are due to rounding error

At one institution I asked why one particular candidate for an administrative post was so attractive - what qualifications did he have? The list began: He wants the job, he looks like an "officer," he has experience, he knows about the future of the ministry. I could not continue or be more specific about talents without revealing confidences. The man in question is well regarded in the theological community. What is of interest is that his willingness to accept the position is his most important qualification. While it is true that one does not want to waste his time and energy on those who will probably reject him; it is startling that a man's potential acceptance of the job and the faculty was more important than his obvious qualifications for the post.

It is unfair to paint a picture of unrelieved grimness. Yet it is equally unfair to pretend that all is well. It is difficult to get good men into administrative positions. One reason for this will be developed in detail. Suffice it to say now that there is no clear consensus about where theological education is or is going. And there is no man strong enough to cause a consensus to coalesce. The future is a mystery. This being the case it is a rare man who will suffer the negative input (from discontented students, faculty, alumni and churches; from failing financial resources; etc.) in order to try for a positive good. I do not want to imply that men who do take these jobs are second rate. I have great respect for all the people I met. What I want to point out is that jobs go seeking men not the other way round. It must be difficult to sustain the caliber of leadership now incumbent in these positions.

They are also alike in that all schools are male WASP preserves. It is not startling that they are largely staffed and attended by Protestants. Even the non-denominational schools are Protestant by birth and tradition. What is startling is the number of Roman Catholic faculty and students. School 1A[3] reported that taking both professional and doctoral students[4], Roman Catholics were a plurality of the student body. It is clear that the winds of change are blowing. At 3A Roman Catholics from a seminary of a religious order were cooperating with the faculty of 3A to create a common curriculum for three institutions - 2 Protestant and 1 Roman Catholic. By and large the pattern is one of institutional cooperation but there are also Roman Catholic faculty who serve as their Protestant colleagues - with dual allegiance to church and seminary.

The institutions are white, through and through. Only 1C.2 is predominantly Black. Even here whites tend to cluster in the Biblical,

---

[3]Henceforth I'll refer to schools by a two digit code. The first digit - a number - will be one of 4 denominational groups. The second - a letter - will be university affiliation. A = university school, B = university affiliate, C = independent. In the cases where there are two schools of a given type, e.g. 2A, I'll distinguish them as 2A.1 and 2A.2.

[4]Professional students are in a curriculum leading to a professional degree such as Bachelor of Divinity or Master of Divinity, etc. Doctoral students are in curricula leading to an academic degree, e.g. Ph.D. or M.A., or an advanced professional degree, e.g. Th.D.

Historical, and Theological disciplines. As in the society at large, high status has a pale hue. With the exception of this one institution Blacks are a rarity. There were only 8 in the other faculties. That is 8 of 373 positions or 2.2%. If they represent the pool of Black talent, then this is a commentary on past practices in institutions which train theological educators as well as on the churches and society in general. If the pool of Black talent is larger, then one must question the current practices of these institutions.

In addition the institutions are male. There were 10 females among 388 full-time positions or 2.6%. Of these: 2 are librarians (1 with academic rank and 1 with faculty status, rank unspecified), 1 is an ethicist, 1 a psychologist. The remaining (6) were in Christian Education.

Clearly theological education is a white male preserve. Only one institution had appreciable numbers of both Blacks and women. There were 3 of each or 6% of the faculty in each group.

I cannot speak for schools outside the sample; however, I doubt that they are different. These schools are among the most liberal within the major Protestant denominations. That others would have a higher proportion of Blacks or women would be surprising. The more schools one would examine the smaller would be the percentages of Blacks and women. In part this is a matter of history and denominational ties which restricted faculty positions to ordained members of the denomination. This meant white and male.

The prospects for change are slim. For the most part these institutions receive little federal money. Thus the government has precious little force to use to get changes. One must depend on moral suasion. All of us, especially those trained in the neo-orthodox versions of the Judeo-Christian tradition, know how weak that is.

Finally, all of these institutions are in some financial difficulty. One of them, 1C.1, reached a decision to stop granting degrees and to run experimental programs during the week I was interviewing. There are a few with substantial endowments, but even these are nervous about the future. Costs are going up faster than endowment income. Mergers may become the only way for fiscal solvency. Faculties, in general, resist this note. If they speak of merger, it is for academic reasons. Yet here and there men have spoken about the financial uncertainties of the future. One of my respondents felt all of his colleagues were dreamers because they felt the institution they worked at had a future.

The American Association of Theological Schools (AATS) statement of theological education for the seventies (Theological Education 1968) has had uncertain effects on these mergers. The plan is for inter-denomination university affiliated seminaries in urban settings. But mergers tend to be within denominational traditions rather than inter-denominational. The latter seems to require a special framework (e.g. The Graduate Theological Union at San Francisco, or The Boston Theological Institute, or The Inter-denominational Theological Center at Atlanta). The experiment involving school 3A may be one of the first inter-denominational mergers. In any case the flight is on to settings in

conjunction with urban universities. For better or worse the monastic image - seminary as a time of retreat and spiritual formation - is a thing of the past or of an idealized state. The present is given over to other images and emphases.

Fifteen Different Schools

School 1A is one of the older and more prestigious of the University Divinity Schools in the U.S.A. Within the last few years it has pioneered a new Masters degree for persons not committed to the parish and a new field education program. At present the M.Div.[5] appears to have very little structure; however, structure is there and more than meets the eye. Students are required to take four courses in the areas that I code Practical and Ancillary. These are related to the work of the church but may be secular academic interpretations, e.g. sociology of religion, or more practical, useful subjects, e.g. homiletics. In addition students are examined for competence in other areas (my coding is Bible, Church History, and Theology). In addition students need to demonstrate competence in two scholarly languages (one at a minimal level), and public speaking. They take one academic area as a major to develop high levels of competence.

There is intense faculty feeling concerning both the new curriculum and the department offering work in the practical and ancillary fields.[6] The new curriculum is seen as a coup by the practical-ancillary fields in that they are the only ones to have required courses. In other areas the student can take courses at his pleasure so long as he passes the exams. There is general expectation that courses will be taken, and some see an underground system of requirements which help prepare for exams. Others are pushing to get students to study on their own and to use classes as a last resort. Some see the new curriculum as a recognition of student maturity and responsibility; others see it as a flight from faculty responsibility to guide students and test their competence. For these latter general exams are not a rigorous enough screen in part because they are not difficult enough, in part because they occur at one point in time and cannot serve to guide a process.

There are some who see the practical-ancillary fields attempting to become a small seminary and, in the process infringing on their academic domains. The primary focus of difficulty seems to be with theology and ethics since topical courses in the practical-ancillary area are readily seen as theological and/or ethical.

---

[5] I am using M.Div. to cover all first professional degree programs. The older title is B.D. (Bachelor of Divinity) but the M.Div. (Master of Divinity) seems to be gaining in acceptance.

[6] The courses in Biblical and Near-Eastern languages and Near-Eastern history and archeology are exempted from this criticism. I put them in ancillary but the school does not; nor do the critics of the practical-ancillary area.

The aura of the institution is academic. Though many faculty are concerned for the corporate life of the church, there is more concern for scholarly attainment. If the Christian clergyman is to be a scholar-pastor-director, then the accent here is on scholar. Students are screened for academic competence with only incidental attention to career commitment and church involvement. Scholarly attainment is high and the best of the faculty are known through their publishing careers. Academic criteria of excellence are all pervasive.

School 1B is an independent school closely affiliated with a major metropolitan university. While it emphasizes academics and takes pride in its internationally known faculty, the academic environment is not so all pervasive as at 1A. In addition it places more accent on the pastoral ministry and on ancillary courses. One is struck by the number of directions a student can go and by the depth of help available to pursue studies in psychiatry and religion, Christian education, practical parish training.

The research was done in the school year 1969-70. This was the year that followed major unrest on many campuses, e.g. Harvard and Columbia. It included the unrest at Kent State and Yale. All of the schools were affected by this state of affairs but none more than 1B. Here the occasion was used to restructure the governance of the institution to make it more democratic. The result was a tremendous investment of everyone's time in committee work. For students this meant balancing committee work against class work and leisure time. For faculty this meant balancing committee work against professional scholarly work and leisure time. As a result of these pressures some faculty and students withdrew from effective participation in governance; a very few withdrew from scholarship. The bulk accommodated themselves to the new regime with minor adjustments. Most felt that the result was a new openness and dialogue between students and faculty. Change was more in terms of atmosphere than specific gains. There was a new loosening of the curriculum, but this was by no means as radical as that of 1A.

This school has a larger number of minorities, both women and blacks, on its faculty than any other. The impact of the Blacks is apparent when one reads the catalogue. Whether their influence extends beyond the classes they teach is debatable. With one exception they did not seem to be involved in governance of the school.

School 1C.1 is an independent school in an urban setting. Of all the schools I visited this was the most troubled financially. During the research year a decision was made to abandon normal degree programs in theological education in order to restructure as a special purpose institution. The president is known for his work as an urban pastor. He sees an opportunity to create a new way to train men[7] for the urban ministry.

---

[7] Lest the feminists take umbrage, men are the concern of theological education. It is a male world. Whether that is just or necessary are other issues.

The new president brought in a new curriculum and form of governance. The form of governance followed that of school 1B but without details of formal structure. The governing body was an assembly at which all members of the community were represented. Whereas the assembly at 1B was dominated by distinguished faculty that at 1C.1 was dominated by the president and the students. The Dean, as spokesman for the faculty, was under constant pressure.

Because of finances, the faculty were released with a year's severance pay which was to be adjusted if they secured new employment. Because the president allied himself with students, most faculty felt isolated and attacked. They saw the president using students to get his own way.

In the space of a decade the school was changing from a quite conservative, almost fundamentalist, stance to one of radical experimentation. The last step in this transition was possible, in part, because the president is more conservative and less radical than he appears. In speech and in personal behavior he radiates clear signals that are picked up by conservatives and radicals alike. Students and others resonate to his demands for change. Conservatives, especially members of the Board of Trustees, resonate to his knowledge of and love for the Biblical faith. He is able to assure both groups that he will hold the other in check.

A new president and a new curriculum brought a sea change in the student body. Students were brighter, freer in personal and social behavior, and much less conservative theologically. New students were more enquirors experiencing life in the "Big City" than committed to a conservative tradition. Newer students used the library less than older students. They experienced life rather than read about it. It is the fervent belief of the president that when the experience begins to overwhelm a person, a Biblically structured Christian faith is essential if one is to put experience into perspective.

School 1C.2 is a predominantly Black institution in a major southern city. While it is beginning to work out affiliations with other institutions, these do not yet affect the student's ability to take courses. Faculty may enjoy a multiplicity of connections with other institutions in the area. Thus I coded the school as independent of other institutions of higher education.

Of all the schools I studied, this is the most clear about its mission and purpose. It is fired by a new sense of Black pride and self-determination. This does not mean that there is unity of opinion and practice at all points. It is a federation with all the troubles a federation has. For many, the federation exists out of necessity (usually finances) or convenience. For many there is long range commitment to a full merger. I don't envy the president's job of maintaining a viable institution, but he relishes it.

Unity of goals does not mean unity of strategy. There are differences within the faculty and student body. But these differences occur within a common commitment.

The faculty is young, bright, and growing intellectually. They will probably not have the time to write or the money to engage in conferences that men at other institutions have. It may be that commitment to Black self-determination will cause them to seek other avenues of expression. There is no doubt that some are capable of making significant scholarly contributions. Whether they do or not depends on whether they see this in their own interest and in the larger interest of Black people and, given a decision to pursue a scholarly career, whether or not the majority opens resources to them.

School 2A.1 is part of a large university in a major metropolitan area. In the year of the study the university was looking for a new president. The school was thinking seriously of a new dean for the present one was of retirement age. Both university and school were moving out of a period of student unrest. It is widely reputed to be one of the best schools in its denomination.

Its scholarly reputation is closely tied to liberal Protestant thought and the process philosophy. Of the university schools this one had the smallest proportion of the faculty in Biblical, Historical, and Theological fields and the largest portion in practical and ancillary fields. In any faculty meeting men in the latter fields had a clear majority of the votes.

The school was in the midst of its second curriculum in four years. The first experiment involved group learning and team teaching. Varieties of backgrounds, interests and goals among the students; less than full commitment (though apparent full cooperation); and an unfortunate coincidence in faculty leaves were all factors that caused the first curriculum to fail. The second curriculum was largely a reaction to the failure of the first. There was not full commitment to the new curriculum but since all the faculty were teaching courses in the traditional manner (i.e., lecture or seminar with team teaching at the initiative of individuals), they found the structures congenial.

School 2A.2 is part of a major southern university. It has great prestige within its denomination and region. For years it has supplied the bulk of the pastors for the southeast region of its denomination. While its faculty have been scholarly, it has been known as a training ground for ministers. Relationships between school and church (local, regional, and national) were and are excellent.

A new administration hopes to capitalize on both strengths from the past. Faculty are encouraged to be scholarly and to contribute to the scholarly life of the church. Faculty morale is high. They see themselves as young but excellent. Ready to mature as an important scholarly community.

There is also an attempt to improve training given to men going into parishes and other church occupations. These improvements are not only in the academic demands placed on them, but also the style of field education.

The faculty are a diverse group whose interests range the theological spectrum. A major task will be to keep the faculty from splitting into factions. If all voices are heard, this faculty will have an exciting mix.

At the time of the study the curriculum required students to sit for general exams at the end of the second year (after 80 quarter hours of work). Following this a student elected a major and wrote a thesis. There were four vocational options open to the student.

2B is adjacent to a major university in a major city. It has always maintained congenial relations with the university. For the most part its role has been to supply denominational pastors to the surrounding area. It has had graduate programs for some time but has not had the reputation of a school like 2A.1.

It was in the process of completely restructuring its curriculum to offer students two options. One was a more or less tradition curriculum which depended on courses in the classical areas in the first year. The second depended on an experiential curriculum which strived to get students "into the world" as well as the books. At the end of the first year both options would allow students free range. At the end of the second year students would be evaluated and recommendations made for their final year of study.

The new student curriculum brought at least two responses from the faculty. Students were treated as "junior learners," faculty as "senior learners," the effect was to cut into traditional sources of faculty authority. The experience ranged from uncomfortable to near catastrophe.

At the same time the authority was undercut the time burden was shifted from students to faculty. For the second year evaluation students prepared a packet of papers from previous courses. They were evaluated in terms of these and other items in their dossier (grades, etc.). The result was that faculty had to prepare for each student separately.

2C was a new school (not two decades old) with a young faculty. It was the most rural school in the survey though it was located in easy commuting distance to a major city. Of all the schools it was most like a retreat. As a new school it had yet to establish a tradition of any kind. While the faculty are capable, they are not recognized scholars. Though the school graduates many men, it is not a commanding influence in its local area. It has not had time to become a "preacher factory" or a "research center." It could easily become a "preacher factory". To become a "research center" will take strenuous efforts on the part of administration and faculty. What they desire is even more difficult to accomplish. They want to be recognized for scholarship while they continue to produce parish ministers.

The curriculum attempts to find a new way within the old. There is a structure of required and elective courses. But considerable attention is paid to interdisciplinary courses. This is a way to offer problem centered material without surrendering departmental accountability.

Because it is relatively small as well as young, students find that they can easily work within the structure. A good student can work out much of his own curriculum in individual study and can get some requirements waived. But good students are few. Most move through the curriculum as it is advertised.

3A is part of a small mid-western denominational college in a fair sized city. It is within easy driving distance of a major university but is quite far - several hundred miles - from a major city. The seminary shares quarters with a seminary of a Roman Catholic order. It appears more closely integrated with the Roman Catholic institution than with the college. Unlike the other university schools, it is not at a major university. In conjunction with the college it forms a university.

Its curriculum was fairly traditional - required and elective courses. Students had to fulfill twelve credits in research, which were about the equivalent of a major, and to do clinical pastoral training. By going to a 4-1-4 plan, the interim month could be used for individual guided work.

In addition, the faculty and students were actively seeking to integrate their curricula with that of the Roman Catholic institution and a near-by Protestant seminary. Hopes for the future ranged from closer cooperation through shared resources (e.g. library and faculty) to full merger.

3B is in a major city and is developing ties with a complex of metropolitan universities. Students must find it difficult to take university courses since the institutions are quite far apart. One would need private cars or coordinated transportation if commuting time were not to be inordinate.

The new curriculum was an attempt to couple broad knowledge of classical theological disciplines with the interests of students. There was to be a distribution of courses without requiring any special one. Biblical languages were still required and individual work - tutorials and reading courses - encouraged. To help the students, a copy of the former required courses was listed as one "example advisors and students might consult in planning a course of study."

During my visit I was struck by two sets of conflicting stimuli. On one hand the institution and its faculty were quite scholarly and traditional in outlook. Some would hold out for a required curriculum and would see any attempt to incorporate newer disciplines, e.g., sociology of religion, as a deviation from the main task. Others appeared quite willing to accept an action oriented-experiential curriculum that would place as much value on action as on reflection and study. There was debate and tension.

3C.1 is one of the oldest and most influential seminaries of this denomination. It is in close proximity to a major university but it has not always enjoyed good relationships with that university. At present there are good relationships between individuals at each institution, but there are not well publicized institutional arrangements which would allow B.D. students to take course work at the university. While this is possible, it seemed remote enough that I coded the school as non-affiliated.

As in its sister schools in this denomination, there is a heavy emphasis on Biblical studies and the classical content of theological education. In an effort to modernize its curriculum, it has shifted from a core curriculum to an insistence on distribution credits. There are only two required courses (Old and New Testaments). In other fields a student is free to choose courses to make up distribution credits. The student takes examinations in English Bible and his major field. He also takes field education and six practicum credits of which four are in the general field of homoletics.

3C.2 is an old seminary in a major city. It is one of the best known of all seminaries in this denomination. It has recently modified its curriculum in hopes that it can take advantage of its location in the city by helping students get involved in an urban ministry. At the same time it expected to maintain high academic standards. At present its program is struggling to meet these goals.

Students are encouraged to be independent. As such they are asked to prepare themselves for basic exams in the fields of Bible, Church History and Theology. Though faculty were available to tutor students

as well as provide reading lists and occasional lectures, it is clear that some modified course arrangement is necessary. For students the system is both too rigid and too unstructured. The exams are rigorous. Though normal students are expected to pass them within the first year, less than one-half actually accomplish this feat. Students feel they are promised the ability to do their own thing and then wind up studying to pass the exams. Furthermore they see this study period as unstructured and unguided. For most the freedom and responsibility are more than they bargained for. The faculty sense this but have not yet been able to do anything about it.

The faculty are trying to work out university affiliations for themselves and their students. Since it is in a major city, it needs university and ecumenical affiliations if it is to qualify as a site for the "curriculum of the seventies" (Theological Education 1968). Despite the fact that there are countless universities and theological seminaries in the city, it is difficult to work out effective cooperative arrangements. The city is large and 3C.2 is not located near other institutions. The logistics of any cooperative venture make it difficult for students to join in.

A separate note needs to be added for all seminaries in this denomination. They are all more conservative than the others I studied. While they would still be recognized as part of the liberal center of Protestant thought, they are different from the others. Faculty use tradition religious language much more frequently than in other seminaries. Academic standards are high but they are not secular academics. Even as a short term visitor this difference impressed me. I noted earlier that as a group they invested more resources in staffing the Biblical field than other seminaries. Their curricula also emphasize the classical content of theological education more than the others. Part of the mismatch between students and faculty at 3C.2 is the faculty's insistence that basic competence be established in the classical content before new frills are added. This is a posture that accents traditional knowledge but does not capitalize on styles and fads.

Though the tone that is set is traditional, not all of the faculty are of this sort. In passing conversation with one man, I pointed out that my visit to 3C.2 showed me that it was different from others I had visited. I was thus curious to see if it was an isolated case or if the denomination was different. When he asked in what way the seminary was different, I told him that faculty used religious symbols freely in conversation and often spoke of desiring students and faculty colleagues who believed in Jesus Christ and were committed to the church. He quipped, "Boy, they're in bad shape." That is a judgment I would not like to make. Suffice it to say that while more conservative than the others, not all the faculty share that position.

Denomination 4 is surprising in that it has no university schools of theology. All of its seminaries are independent though some have close affiliations with universities. It is hard to say why this is so. It has historical ties with two major university schools but both of these are independent of denominational control. Thus the university school part of the design is missing for this denomination.

4B is located in a major metropolitan center adjacent to a prestigious university. It is an old institution, one of the first founded west of the Allegany Mountains. It has a small faculty and student body. It maintains a core faculty and uses the university divinity school to supply instruction in more esoteric sub-fields, e.g. theology and literature.

In the early 1960's the curriculum was revised by the current senior faculty. This was at the time of the defederation of the Federated Theological Faculties. At that time these men felt that their new curriculum was a model for the future. Inquiries from other institutions bolstered this feeling. The result is that since the early 60's no major modification of the curriculum has occurred. Still it is less traditional than most in that it provides students freedom to work out courses with a minimum of distribution requirements. It is also more liberal than most, particularly in contrast with schools in denomination 3.

Without doubt 4B was the most open to its own students. They were represented on all boards and committees. They could, and did, speak freely. They could easily gain information about school financing, e.g. investment portfolios. Relationships between students and faculty were the easiest of all the schools I visited.

4C.1 is located in a small town adjacent to a liberal arts college. Historically it is part of a reformed church with an ethnic population. It is part of denomination 4 because of church mergers. Yet it is not out of place. There was no sense of strain; no sense that the merger put an essentially conservative school in a liberal mix.

The school has been assessing its future with an eye to merger. Just prior to my visit it hired a new president. That move put a tempoary end to talks of merger. At least one faculty member thought this was a mistake. He remarked that most of his colleagues were deluded because they thought the school had a future. How long a future it has will depend on solutions to financial problems and an increase in the student body. There are not enough students to support the faculty now teaching; yet it cannot be cut without omitting a major area of theological study.

The faculty were trying to swing with the times but location made this difficult. There is no major city or university nearby. Thus all "curriculum of the seventies" plans require extensive transportation. Despite this the faculty have tried to be innovative. Though there is a suggested core of courses which functions as a phantom curriculum, all students construct their own courses then sit for examinations which cover Bible, Church History, Theology, and Practice. They have made imaginative use of large blocks of time - take students on field excursions of at least a month. These go to different type churches as well as overseas. The faculty also teach many courses in company with colleagues. I sense that this is a natural outgrowth of faculty interest and development rather than part of some master plan. As such it is on firmer ground than those attempts at other schools to create cooperative teaching by policy decision. Still one is not impressed by

the long term prospects of the school. It continues to train pastors for a constituency that it has serviced for well over 100 years. As that constituency dwindles in numbers and financial strength, the future of the school is clouded.

4C.2 is in a major metropolitan center with a major university. Yet it is physically isolated from both the university and the inner city. It sits on a large tract of land in a residential area at the edge of the city so that it appears to be more rural or suburban than urban. It is small and in a precarious financial condition. Though its faculty is small the student body is too small to support it. As in the case of 4C.1 it is impossible to cut back on faculty without omitting essential areas.

Students take a common core of material that covers about half of their class time (16 of 23 credits for the degree). This core is spread equally over Biblical, Historical, Theological, and Ancillary - Practical studies. In addition to the required core, students sit for examinations and write a senior paper. The daily calendar is arranged so that a student spends his whole day on one subject rather than dividing it between classes. This means that courses occur all day once a week.

A major thread that runs through the curriculum proposals of most schools is an attempt to individualize the curriculum. When this is carried through in full it presents the faculty with a whole new structure for time and evaluation of students. Each student is evaluated in terms of his own work and progress. Thus faculty must know students individually if they are to evaluate them. The time spent preparing for evaluation passes from student to faculty. At the time of evaluation preparation is guided by the student's background rather than universal notions, e.g. structure of the field, minimum amount of knowledge.

The most likely sources for the shift to individualized curricula are the students' drive for a personalized society and the faculty's memory of graduate training. On all hands one hears pleas for renewed interest in human beings. An end to the easy way of treating people by categorizing them. If taken seriously this requires a very flexible educational scheme. The one model available to all faculty is their own graduate training. They were known as individuals by members of their dissertation committees. Surely this is a happy solution to the temper of the times.

But the logistics of processing a handful of doctoral candidates are different from those of processing 60 to 100 B.D. students. The students interests and competence are not as narrowly focused; the faculty do not know them as well. Thus faculty often resort to examinations or distribution credits simply to manage an otherwise unmanageable task.

In addition these students are not as learned as Ph.D. candidates. One must balance their pleas for freedom against the pleas of ones colleagues for a minimal amount of information and scholarly ability if one is to be well trained. One can consider these minimums as part of

the rites of passage to a more elevated social status. Or one can consider them as written into the nature of human existence. In either case they are social facts which limit options for behavior. For some faculty - not to evaluate students in terms of some universal criteria - is violation of a sacred trust.

Thus students are given freedom to select courses within limits. Most schools have defined these limits so closely that students do not have a feeling of freedom. Further these limits - whatever their intellectual merit - serve to reinforce the status of student as learner and faculty as learned. While this consequence is unintended, it is not surprising. Nor is it the result of ill will or Machiavellian manipulation. Points of view differ depending on place in the social system. The conflict is systemic. So long as the system stays defined as it is conflict will continue.

Summary of Interview Data

A description of the focused interview appears as Appendix A. That appendix describes the flow of the interview. Briefly I began by getting certain demographic and personal information, then asked the respondent to address himself to certain curricular changes. Together these accounted for 50 to 60% of the interview. I then asked them to discuss students and other faculty members. I closed by asking them about their own careers and about the future of the church.

The interviews lasted about 50 minutes. Some were shorter and a few longer. The longest ran two hours; the shortest 30 minutes. The great majority (80 percent) ran 45 to 55 minutes.

Since the interviews were focused, they followed an outline but without specific questions. As long as the respondent was producing useful information, I let him talk. If he anticipated later sections of the interview, I noted the fact. At the appropriate point I asked him to expand his views if he cared to.

On the whole rapport was good. I was able to maintain a conversational atmosphere. This helped the respondents relax and talk freely. For the most part the interview did not seem to threaten them. Many were quite interested in the flow of the interview and asked for copies of the results. I will try to honor these requests with copies of this report.

The opening section of the interview secured background information and got them to thinking about their own careers. I elicited information on their educational background and on their work history. For the most part they are holders of advanced academic degrees and had spent the better part of their professional careers in academic positions. Only a small minority had spent a significant amount of time as pastors or viewed themselves as pastors who had become teachers. Most of them viewed themselves as academic professionals and saw their professional experience in that light. What little pastoral experience they had had was incidental to another career.

These self-identities came to the fore when I asked why they had accepted their present position. For those taking their first position this was a chance to discuss their calling. Only one of the younger men saw this career as something that came seeking him. Even he did not put this as a call from God rather it was a call from Alma Mater, though unexpected and unsolicited. Others saw themselves in an academic market place. A composite, typical response would be:

> Well I went to graduate school and trained for this kind of position and when I finished this was the best job available. Other jobs were in college departments of religion but I wanted to be in a seminary to help train men for the ministry, and I wanted to have graduate students to teach.

Coming to teach at the seminary involves activating that part of their past that lead them to seminary as students (to help train men for the ministry). For most of them it means training men for a job that they have never done as a full time career. This is not necessarily bad if they recognize this.

The drive to teach graduate students is also strong. Graduate seminars are more geared to profession advancement than seminary courses. If all of your teaching consists of summarizing known information for a survey course, then any research or writing you do will consume time over and above that given to teaching. With a graduate seminar, it is possible to merge some of the course preparation time with research time. It may also be possible to present draft forms of material that will be submitted for publication.

Among older men and among those in smaller seminaries the sense of themselves as pastors who are now teachers is more common though these men are still a tiny minority. Once again most men see themselves as academic professionals. If this is not their first academic position, then they see their transfer in academic terms. The position offers better students (usually graduate students), better colleagues (more academically inclined, more scholarly), better research facilities (library), more time for research and more specialized teaching. In short they go to better scholarly environments. As with young men just entering the field, their choice of positions is quite unaffected by notions of a call (either in Weberian[8] or classical Protestant terms). They are academic professionals who train men for the ministry while they pursue their own career goals. Once again, this is not necessarily bad if it is recognized.

Having established how long respondents had been at their current position I asked them to comment on curricular changes at the school. If they were present during the period, they could, and did, provide eye-witness accounts. Otherwise they reported the history as it was told to them. In all cases at least 75% of the faculty could provide eyewitness accounts of the changes. In all cases there was a major curricular change in the period 1962-1969.

---

[8] See the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.

Movements for change within a system usually begin from some notion that the system as presently constituted is inadequate. Though notions of inadequacy could come from many sources most respondents indicated that faculty were the first to move for change. In a few cases student pressure was perceived as important but almost always less important than faculty pressure. In two instances campus violence, within the university or at nearby universities, sparked the change. In all institutions, save one, there is a vague sense of unease, that whatever is being done to educate ministers, is somehow not right. But this sense of unease is not focused. It means constant attention to curriculum with the prospect of major revision every few years. Lack of a common vision also means that little promise is held for these revisions. Curricula are in a constant state of revision with the most consistent method being trial and error.

One of my hopes was that theological education would show a strong normative component. If so, curricular changes would be guided by it. There would be resonance between the norms and curricular structure. In my own days as a seminary student that norm was neo-orthodoxy and especially the theological position of Karl Barth. This is no longer true. Several respondents pointed out that there was no normative concensus and that Barth, in particular, was passe.

> I watched Barth's work with interest because I knew he was either the beginning or end of an era. I have concluded he was the end.

or

> Regardless of the value it had, the Barthian synthesis is over.

There are many individuals who would contest this point of view and argue that Barth's influence is still strong. It is on individuals; it is not on theological education as a whole. In fact no one person or group of persons stands out as influential. The giants have passed from the scene and no one has risen to replace them.

I also anticipated that one or two prestigious schools would serve as models for the others. This hypothesis was not borne out. Very few respondents recalled a particular model for their curricular change. Committees got information from other schools but, for the most part, rejected it. The one explicit case of modelling I found did not involve a prestigious school. Some faculty from 2B had begun teaching at a school not in my sample. There they put into operation some ideas held in common with influential faculty at 2B. Thus when change was possible at 2B, this other school was the model. The faculty at 2B also consciously rejected the curriculum at 2A.1 as a model. At this point they were about one year ahead of the faculty at 2A.1.

Nor was there consensus about the skills or knowledge needed by the graduate. This is clear partly in the fact that education is individualized. A common goal concerning graduates would yield some pressure toward a common curriculum, but this pressure is conspicuous

by its absence. Almost all curricular changes tend to weaken structure. Under the guise of giving the student responsibility for his own education, faculty tend to abdicate responsibility for shaping him in a particular direction. This is not a conscious design on the part of the faculty. Rather it is a latent function of the fact that there are strong disagreements among the faculty about the content of theological education. Faculty are impressed with the normative position that students should be responsible for their own futures and that they should be free to construct their education after being counselled by faculty. It is assumed that faculty guidance and counselling will be adequate. But if there is no common vision, then the content of the counselling depends on the counsellor.

Another indicator of the lack of consensus about the content of theological education was the response to the question: What are you saying about an individual when you grant him a professional degree? Answers covered the range:

> Definitely, that he can be ordained.
>
> Well, it's an academic degree. I'm not sure what it says about ordination, but that's the church's problem.
>
> Whatever else it means; it doesn't mean that the guy can be ordained.
>
> Caveat Emptor! Let the buyer beware.

Only a minority of faculty still hold that the degree is a recommendation for ordination. Most of these are concentrated in denomination 2. As one of the faculty put it:

> We know the students better than anyone else. They've been with us for the last 3 years. We know their development and capacities. To surrender this responsibility to a church agency is to give the decision over to people who know the student less well than we do.

It is also true that traditions in denominations 3 and 4 require a more complete examination of the candidate than denomination 2 does. Denomination 3 has national examinations for candidates. In denomination 4 examinations are conducted by regional clergy associations. Thus faculty with this background are more able to see their task as educational. The church will examine candidates to test both the quality of their education and their personal appropriateness for the ministry.

At the same time even strong proponents of the position the seminary training is only academic are faced with a frequently indifferent church. At one institution, 4C.2, the faculty have formally decided that the professional degree is not to be a recommendation for ordination. In fact they have on two occasions recommended that church bodies <u>not</u> ordain their graduates. In both cases the men were ordained. As best as the

faculty could determine the degree they granted was more important than the reservations they expressed.

Since many seminaries have students from many denominations, and since the response of churches runs from explicit testing of candidates, through a desultory check, to outright disregard for seminary opinions, and since many curricula no longer have specific required courses, many faculty throw up their hands and declare - Caveat Emptor. For them the degree means three years of residence, fulfillment of all academic requirements that aren't waved by committee, and good enough behavior not to be dismissed. In effect, a bureaucratic system in which anyone with persistence, moderate academic performance, and a low profile will advance to the degree. This means that without some personal contact with a student the faculty member could not certify him either for graduate study or ordination. As the internal system becomes more individualized, certain crucial relationships between system members and other systems become individualized or particularized. There are no general expectations for all graduates though there is knowledge of a few of them. The universe is so varied that one cannot have confidence in any sample drawn from it. Most students are well known by a few faculty; few are well known by all. The schools are not impersonal but they are not tight-knit communities. In particular they are not spiritual communities. To a man Roman Catholics teaching at these seminaries notice this. Spiritual formation is missing or poorly attended to. They see the institutions failing to form the personal and spiritual character of the students.

In addition the strong proponents of the academic model must contend with their inability to state what the average student knows when he finishes. It is not that students are poor or indifferent. It is that they are poorly guided - especially in the more innovative, student-centered curricula. It is difficult to see the seminary as a strong academic institution if one is unsure of the amount known by students at graduation. Thus certain faculty members, generally in the Biblical and historical fields, hold out for core curricula and/or some check on a student's competence, something like a comprehensive exam. But for the moment, the trend is against these men.

The student-centered or individualized curriculum is more closely related to graduate education than anything else. Students are taken to be responsible for their own education. However, in general, they have neither the professional interests of graduate students nor the persistence to pursue these interests on their own. Thus what is freedom for graduate students may be anarchy for seminarians. What may be a way of checking independent work of graduate students may be very restrictive for seminarians. Finally, what can be a fine, meaningful relationship between a handful of graduate students and a handful of faculty can be a logistics nightmare when the handful of students expands to a class of 100.

At several seminaries students were defined as passive-dependent. This definition is obviously psychological and depends upon certain entrance test results for its validity. Not all users of the term were psychologists, but only one was sensitive to the fact that he didn't understand it as fully as he wished. The implications of the term in

describing students is that they are docile; they lack initiative. They are more followers than leaders. If this view of students is true, then any attempt to individualize education, to throw students on their own resources will fail because students can't cope with this responsibility or will be rescued only by the expenditure of a great deal of faculty time counselling and evaluating students. Since faculty have not spent inordinate amounts of time counselling students, they have either become lost or have followed former patterns. In most cases where the curriculum is individualized most students follow the last carefully structured curriculum - partly because that is lodged in the student culture and partly because it is lodged in the minds of faculty counsellors.

At 3C.2 there was a curious mismatch between faculty and student attitudes toward freedom and restriction in studies. The curriculum demanded that students pass general examinations in Bible, Church History, and Theology as pre-conditions for advanced study. Students were given absolute freedom in the way they would prepare for these examinations. They could go at their own pace in their own way. From the student's side this was no freedom at all. They had to study these subjects and not others. Freedom was to choose your own subject. Further a lack of formal classes lead to student anomie and much aimless work that resulted in unsatisfactory performance on exams. Faculty began instituting non-credit courses to prepare for exams. Students liked these because they were a structured way to arrive at a pre-set goal. The curriculum faltered because it assumed students who were committed to a particular goal and who would appreciate freedom in working their way. Of the students who came in not all were committed to the goal and many required structure rather than freedom.

Finally, the time drain on the faculty is clearly recognized. When it comes to evaluating students, if the curriculum is individualized, there are few general criteria students can meet.

> The time burden has been shifted from students to faculty.
>
> It used to be that students had to study and prepare for general exams. Now they submit papers and other documents which we must study in order to examine them.

This can be so time consuming that faculty have little time for other occupations.

In sum curricular changes are toward less structure, more individualized education. This means more student initiative in the shaping of education. This occurs in part because faculty agree to norms of responsibility and freedom for students. Whether students are ready to bear these burdens is another issue not faced fully by the faculty. Partly it is an adaptation of graduate education which was the best educational experience the faculty remembers. They are trying to recreate, for students, the kind of experience they had as graduate students. Finally, education is individualized because no one vision of seminary education is strong enough to master the field. No one has a clear picture of a seminary graduate. Without that, it is hard to decide on curricula. Or if one decides that the occupations that make

up ministry are legion, then training is so multiple that standardization is senseless. The failure to have a common vision of the future of graduates is the obverse side of the failure to have a common vision of seminary education. The two go hand in hand.

Turning from curricular matters, I asked them what kind of students they wanted to admit to seminary. A composite response would be:

> Well! First of all we need better students. We'd like to get a few more A students and fewer marginal students. Then, these students ought to be alive to the world - concerned about what's going on. They ought to be innovative, some of them maybe radical - not too many but enough to liven it up. Students are too docile now.
>
> And - Oh Yes! - psychologically healthy. We spend too much time patching people up. If they're healthy when they enter, our job is easier.

Then I asked: What about their vocational commitments?

> Oh! Yes! If they want to be ministers or have church careers, that's better. But we take them even if they don't. As long as a fellow is honest, that's all right with me.

Then I asked: What about their theological commitments?

> Oh! No! We don't make them subscribe to a creed.

No, but do you care if they believe?

> Oh! That's good, of course. But if they're just inquirers, we'll take them. So long as they're serious students.

The picture that emerges is of faculties that care for the intellectual promise of their students. Beyond that there is little a student can say or do to disqualify himself.

As I said earlier, there is a minority of faculty who look for Christian believers interested in becoming ministers. They are a minority though stronger in denomination 3 than the others. And if one respondent is correct, they search for a rare breed. When I asked about vocational and theological commitment, he said:

> Of course, if I had my druthers, I'd like students who were Christian believers and committed to the ministry as a career, but you can't get those students anymore.

The list of student qualities can be summed:

1. educational competence
2. sensitivity to socio-political-economic events
3. psychological health
4. } vocational and
5. } religious commitment

Since the prevailing view of the B.D. is that it is an academic degree, this list is another witness to the ascendence of academic criteria. Those qualities that can be formed in a man to make him spiritual are not important enough to appear without probing.

Qualities that respondents wanted to see in faculty colleagues matched those of students.

> Of course, competence in his own field.
> But alert, alive, a good colleague.
> Interested in the world.
> A good teacher.

Again explicit references to the quality of colleagues spiritual or religious life are lacking. This despite the fact that setting and question together suggested that these answers aren't enough. I could have gotten them from any faculty. One respondent openly recognized this:

> Obviously, they must be competent. But you can't mean only that. No, if a man teaches in a seminary he needs more than competence - he needs a sort of ---- wisdom.

This wisdom turned out to be fairly secular - wise in the ways of dealing with young men, empathetic, gifted in counselling but not explicitly religious.

I also asked respondents about additions to the present faculty if funds permitted. This was to see if they had in mind an ideal distribution of faculty. It was another attempt to see if there was a grand design for seminary education. Responses almost always began:

> More men in my department.

This was usually justified on the grounds that teaching could be more specialized. With more men teaching boundaries and scholarship boundaries would more nearly coincide.

Beyond that first suggestion there was no unanimity in the responses. Individuals had visions but they did not cumulate. At this point the lack of a common vision was overlaid with another problem. For almost all men at all schools, the question was hypothetic to the point of absurdity. Budgets were shrinking. The task at hand was to reduce staff, not add. Many responded by saying:

> That's not our situation. We have to reduce staff.

When I pressed them to play the game, they did but first set out catalogues of conditions to justify expansion. When they insisted on discussing ways of reducing staff, these showed no design for they were couched in terms of tenure, academic rank, and budget.

At this point the interview turned back to refocus on the respondent; I was trying to get a grip on the intellectual context in which they worked. Among other things I asked: What contemporary scholars stimulated them? Who their closest intellectual comrades were? and what events or persons influenced their careers as scholars and teachers?

It is clear from responses that no scholar or group of scholars dominates the current scene. Responses range all over the lot. I tried always to caution respondents to consider the whole intellectual scene not merely their own discipline. This may have made consensus more difficult, but I doubt it. Many were relieved not to be confined to scholars in the theological field because:

> They aren't doing anything worthwhile now.

Despite failure to yield up a set of giants influencing theological education the list is interesting. Responses range:

> Well, I don't do much reading now. My intellectual input comes from other sources, for example, I spend a lot of time talking with members of the Blackstone Rangers.
>
> Certainly no theologians, but Marcuse, McLuhan, critics of contemporary culture.
>
> There are people trying to develop a critical text for the New Testament. They're doing exciting work.

The last quote is archtypical of many lists when respondents confined themselves to scholarship within their own field. Authors cited had eminence due to achievements within the field or were important to the scholarly concerns of the respondent.

Other facts of note are the absence of women and black scholars. To the best of my knowledge there are no women authors in the list. Given the small numbers of women teaching this is no surprise. There are also few women intellectuals of note to choose from. Still at the time of the research (1969-70), women's liberation was beginning to make headlines. The literature of this liberation movement had not yet made any impact on the consciousness of my respondents.

Of the white respondents, there were very few men who mentioned black authors and only a handful who gave them a prominent place. A minority got around to mentioning Martin Luther King or Malcolm X at some point in their list. Only two cited lists of black authors as prominent influences. Both of these men were trying to put together courses about the black experience. Whether or not they can do this is a moot point. The fact is that black intellectuals make very little impact on the consciousness of theological faculty.

When asked about intellectual comrades most men cited others in their own scholarly area. Answers to this question can be used both to distinguish locals (who cite local colleagues first or more frequently than non-local ones) and cosmopolitans (who cite non-locals first or more frequently). Once this distinction has been made, the data can be reanalyzed to see if there are differences between them. I will also be able to get some grip on the intellectual structure of the schools.

Pending these more sophisticated analyses the answers given are striking in two respects: very few blacks or women are cited. This shows the white male dominance in theological education. Whites do not look to blacks nor blacks to whites as intellectual comrades. This is basically true even when they are on the same faculty.

Only ten of the respondents cited women and nine of these were wives. Only one cited a woman faculty colleague. Even the few women did not cite other women. Of the wives cited, only one was cited first. And in one instance a wife who had co-authored books with her husband was cited only after I probed. The respondent said:

> That was a mistake /omitting my wife/ but I think of our collaboration as a single unit. I don't see some of it coming from her and some from me. Besides she is in another field.

When asked about influences that shaped their careers most cite persons rather than events. Because I accented their careers as scholars and teachers most cited former instructors - college, seminary, or graduate school. Once again the list is endless, but this time names stand out. Respondents, who had studied at Yale, cited H. Richard Niebuhr, Roland Bainton, and Robert L. Calhoun. Calhoun for his commanding intelligence, Niebuhr and Bainton for their intelligence and humaneness. Respondents, who had studied at McCormack, cited G. Earnst Wright; those from Union in New York, James Muilenberg. Both were cited for intellect and humaneness. In most cases people who made a difference were people who cared, who could be remembered because they were humane.

Information about careers is the best point to introduce the major unanticipated finding. The reader will note that there are no references to explicitly religious material throughout the interview. Men discussed their jobs, their careers, their schools, students and faculty colleagues without recourse to traditional religious language. While it might be argued that this is a function of the interview I think this is not the case.

First, I tried to make clear my dual connection: Methodist minister and sociologist. For many I spent a few minutes discussing my faculty appointment - in the sociology department at Yale rather than at the Yale Divinity School. I also was introduced to the faculty by a letter from Professor James Gustafson of Yale Divinity School. Thus I tried to say that I was part of and sympathetic to the religious enterprise.

Second, many men, though a minority, used religious language.

Faculty in denomination 3, particularly school 3C.1, used religious language in discussing students. For many the first criteria for students was Christian belief and the second commitment to the ministry. A few spoke of their careers as callings. On the whole this language usage was so rare as to be striking.

The incident which brought this fact to my attention occurred during interviews at 3A. I was exploring reasons for a growing rapprochement between three theological schools but especially 3A and a Roman Catholic school. I had interviewed about half dozen faculty and gotten a fairly precise history of the events from beginning (a casual meeting on a passenger train) to the present (shared quarters and plans for shared courses and faculty). The next interview brought this response:

> If you don't mind my saying so, I think that was Providential.

I was struck first by the fact that a theological professor would apologize for using Providence in this way. Then I noted that in ten weeks of interviewing (and I can now extend this to all interviews) this was the first (and only) reference to God in this way.

Biblical scholars often talk of God as the God of History. Theological educators can discuss their own life history and the history of their schools without reference to such a notion.

My interview material is overwhelmingly secular. Curricula changes are defended on the basis of learning theory, attempts to create action oriented clergy, freedom and responsibility of students, etc. Never for reasons drawn from disciplined reflection on the Christian faith, that is theological-normative reasons are lacking. Students and faculty colleagues are discussed in terms of academic competence, openness to the world, and psychological health.

I find this linguistic lacuna disturbing. It can be discussed most adequately in the context of two different though overlapping debates: professional vs. academic vs. occupational training and specialist vs. generalist ministers. The debates are connected because both have implications for theological education. How much do you emphasize academics? How much do you emphasize particular aspects of ministry at the expense of more general competence? How much should you emphasize the ability to function in unknown or unpredicted situations? All these questions can and often do dodge the central issue: what has the central aspect of the role of religious specialists been? Put other ways: what are religionists specialists in? If they are professionals, what is the center of their competence?

Following Margaret Mead, I would suggest that the central aspect of the religious specialist's role has been his ability to speak of and for the gods. He has been the primary source of knowledge of the transcendent. In that stream of sociology of religion which begins with Durkheim's, Elementary Forms of the Religious Life, and winds through various channels to Peter Berger's, Sacred Canopy, the religious specialist is a world maintainer. He assures us of the cosmic significance

of the social arrangements we have chosen to live with. The social fabric is so fragile that the question: How does society continue to exist? is still an important theoretical question. The function of religious specialists is one important answer.

Yet, if Bonhoeffer and others are right when they contend that the world has come of age no longer needing religion, that education which bring a man to understand himself as a world maintainer or guarantor of the cosmic significance of social arrangements condemns its students to the margins of society. They are well trained specialists for a job few want done. They are anachronistic, a throw back to a prior age.

If they surrender this role, what shall they do? A social critic needs some basis for his criticism. A change agent needs some way to distinguish good from bad changes.

It is my contention that the failure to use religious language is an indication that the role of religious specialist as world maintainer is being abandoned. The lack of clear vision about theological education; lack of consensus about major intellectual figures, about the meaning of the professional degree, are indications that nothing has arrived to replace the old image.

REFERENCES

Becker, Howard
1963 Boys In White. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berger, Peter L.
1961 The Precarious Vision. New York: Doubleday.

1967 The Sacred Canopy. New York: Doubleday.

Directory of Theological Schools
1968 The American Association of Theological Schools, Dayton, Ohio.

Durkheim, Emile
1961 The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. New York: Crowell-Collier.

Harrison, Paul M.
1967 Theological Education and the United Church of Christ. Commission on Theological Education. United Church of Christ, New York, New York.

Holmer, Paul
1964 "Can we educate ministers scientifically?" Pg. 2-29 in Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver, The Making of Ministers. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.

Mead, Margaret
1970 "As seen by a social scientist." Pastoral Psychology 21 (February):8-15.

Miller, David R. and Guy E. Swanson
1958 Changing American Parent. New York: Wiley.

Stark, Rodney and Charles Y. Glock
1968 American Piety. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Theological Curriculum for the 1970s.
1968 Theological Education IV (Spring) No. 3.

Theological Education in the 1970s.
1968 Redevelopment of Resources. Theological Education IV (Summer) No. 4.

Weber, Max
1958 The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

APPENDIX A. FOCUSED INTERVIEW FOR RESEARCH

I. Background Information

In the opening section of the interview I tried to establish general background characteristics of the individuals. I asked their age and the occupations of their father and their father's father. I next solicited information concerning their educational and professional careers; where this information was available from published materials, I did not ask but used the published information. I next asked about their level of activities in church organizations and professional organizations. I then questioned them about their coming to teach at that particular seminary and whether or not they looked upon this as a place in which they could satisfactorily develop their career. I asked about the strengths and weaknesses of that particular seminary.

II. Specific Comments About The Curriculum

This section varied substantially from seminary to seminary as well as from individual to individual. To prepare for these questions, I read back issues of the catalogue to determine major changes in the curriculum. With this background, I questioned the informants about the changes, whether or not they viewed them as major changes, and what were the primary reasons for the changes occurring, what were the principle reasons used to oppose the changes, and in some cases who were the principle characters both for and against the changes as they occurred. This was a rather free discussion period which I let flow pretty much at the demand of the informant. I would occasionally probe for information and occasionally raise counter points of view to elicit their responses.

III. The Students

In this section I encouraged the respondent to talk about students and in particular to list the characteristics he would find desirable in students when they entered the seminary and the kinds of things he would expect a student to know when the student was granted a degree.

IV. The Faculty

In this section, I asked the respondents what kinds of qualities they would like to see in faculty colleagues. I also asked what additional faculty they would like to see hired. The latter was to see whether or not they viewed their present faculty as a complete faculty or whether there were certain areas of theological discipline that they felt were being slighted by the present faculty arrangements.

V. Respondents Career and Intellectual Context

I asked the faculty members to think back over their own career and specifically over their academic career. I then asked them for the formative influences on their career developments. Following this, we talked about their closest intellectual comrades. I asked them what contemporary thinkers they found exciting and stimulating. This phrasing was to avoid asking them about thinkers they agreed with or were in some sense trying to follow. They quite frequently responded that they were excited or stimulated by people with whom they disagreed violently. I was interested in this section on sources of intellectual stimulus. I asked about the kinds of things they were working on currently outside the structure of their regular courses. And then asked them to look toward the future and to evaluate the future of both the church and ministry.

VI. Life History

I then asked each of the men to sketch his perceptions of his life history in terms of stages and turning points. Turning points would be those events and experiences which cause one's life to take a different direction. Stages would be the periods of development in between turning points. I asked them to draw this up on a sheet of paper which I supplied. This paper was then returned to me at a later point, normally by mail back to my New Haven office.

Since the interview was focused, I never asked quite the same question to each individual. In particular, if an individual answered a later question in the interview in the process of answering an earlier one, I simply did not ask the later question. If I did ask for related information later on, I was sure to mention that I had heard something which was applicable earlier in the interview so that the respondent felt free to say: I have said everything I need to say about that, or could say: In addition to that, there are some other things. In this sense, the interviews were rather free and though focused not rigidly structured. Most interviews lasted approximately 50 minutes. I was able to schedule interviews at hourly intervals and was able to make an introductory remark about my own background and the research and complete the interview without falling behind schedule. Thus, it is my impression that the interviews themselves lasted approximately 50 minutes.

APPENDIX B

This appendix consists of detailed tables giving the number and percent of all full time faculty above the rank of assistant professor and the number and percent of faculty interviewed. Information is given by denominational, university affiliation and teaching area.

TABLE B.1

Numbers of Faculty and Number Interviewed by Denomination, University Affiliation, and Subject Area

University Affiliation	Subject Area	Denomination 1		2		3		4	
		Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]
University School	Bible	3	4	11	11	4	4		
	Church History	5	7	6	8	3	3		
	Theology	3	5	8	11	2	3		
	Practical	3	4	13	16	6	7		
	Ancillary	4	10	9	18	1	3		
	Total	18	30	47	64	16	20		
University Affiliated School	Bible	2	8	5	5	9	10	2	2
	Church History	3	5	3	3	4	4	2	2
	Theology	6	9	3	4	2	4	2	2
	Practical	6	18	8	12	7	10	5	6
	Ancillary	4	11	5	8	3	5	5	5
	Total	21	51	24	32	25	33	16	17
Independent	Bible	3	6	3	4	9	13	5	6
	Church History	2	3	3	3	8	11	3	3
	Theology	2	3	2	2	6	11	2	4
	Practical	12	12	4	7	11	22	8	10
	Ancillary	3	3	5	6	7	8	4	5
	Total	22	27	17	22	41	65	22	28

a Interviewed
b Total Full Time Faculty at Rank of Assistant Professor or Higher

TABLE B.2

Percent of Faculty Interviewed By Denomination, University Affiliation, and Subject Area

University Affiliation	Subject Area	Denomination 1	2	3	4	Total
University School	Bible	75	100	100		84
	Church History	71	75	100		78
	Theology	60	73	67		72
	Practical	75	81	86		82
	Ancillary	40	50	33		45
	Total	60	74	80		70
University Affiliated School	Bible	25	100	90	100	72
	Church History	60	100	100	100	86
	Theology	67	75	50	100	68
	Practical	33	75	70	83	56
	Ancillary	36	63	60	100	59
	Total	41	75	74	94	65
Independent	Bible	50	75	69	83	69
	Church History	67	100	73	100	80
	Theology	67	100	55	50	60
	Practical	100	57	50	80	69
	Ancillary	100	83	88	80	86
	Total	82	77	63	79	72
Total	Bible	44	100	82	88	74
	Church History	67	86	83	100	81
	Theology	65	76	56	67	66
	Practical	44	71	62	81	67
	Ancillary	46	59	69	90	61
	Total	51	75	69	84	69

TABLE B.3

Percent Faculty and Percent Interviewed by Denomination, University Affiliation, and Subject Area

University Affiliation	Subject Area	Denomination 1		2		3		4	
		Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]	Int.[a]	Fac.[b]
University School	Bible	17	13	23	17	25	20		
	Church History	28	23	13	12	19	15		
	Theology	17	17	17	17	12	15		
	Practical	17	13	28	25	38	35		
	Ancillary	22	33	19	28	6	15		
	Total[c]	101	99	100	99	100	100		
University Affiliated School	Bible	10	16	21	16	36	30	13	12
	Church History	14	10	12	9	16	12	13	12
	Theology	29	18	12	12	8	12	13	12
	Practical	29	35	33	38	28	30	31	35
	Ancillary	19	22	21	25	12	15	31	29
	Total[c]	101	101	99	100	100	99	101	100
Independent	Bible	14	22	18	18	22	20	23	21
	Church History	9	11	18	14	20	17	14	11
	Theology	9	11	12	9	15	17	9	14
	Practical	54	44	24	32	27	34	36	36
	Ancillary	14	11	29	27	17	12	18	18
	Total[c]	100	99	101	100	101	100	100	100

a Interviewed
b Total Full Time Faculty at Rank of Assistant Professor or Higher
c Totals other than 100 are due to rounding error

APPENDIX C

Early in the research it was necessary to adopt a scheme to categorize the teaching assignments of faculty members and the courses taught. This is one of the ways to judge the allocation of resources within the seminary. Realizing that I would have few cases, I decided on a system of very few categories. An expanded system (48 categories) has been used by Paul Harrison. It is listed at the end of this appendix for comparison with mine. Its virtue is in the detailed information it conveys. Its weakness is that some aggregation must be done in order to make comparisons. Any aggregation will have to face the problems to be discussed.

I began from the traditional classification of theological subjects: Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal and Practical studies. This proved inadequate since many subjects, e.g. psychology of religion, do not fall neatly into any category. Thus I modified the scheme to include two more categories: Ancillary and Not Elsewhere Classified. Areas of instruction covered are:

Bible

> Old and New Testament, English Bible, Inter-testamental Period, Biblical Theology, Hermeneutics. In general courses dealing with the content or construction of the Bible or with its interpretation.

Church History

> All of church history, Historical Theology, Missions, Ecumenics, History of Religions where courses have Christian content or are related to missions. In general courses which accent the history of the Christian movement. Missions, Ecumenics, and History of Religions are included because these have a historical approach more often than any other.

Theology

> Systematic Theology, Constructive Theology, Doctrine, Dogmatics, Christian or Religious Ethics, Social Ethics. In general, the rational elaboration of Christian thought and experience with the accent on understanding the contemporary Christian experience.

Practical

> Homiletics, Worship, Christian Education, Church Finance and Administration, Counselling, Church and Community. In general, instruction that emphasizes development of skills and/or theory related to the actual practice of ministerial roles. All field education was located here.

Ancillary

This category presented the greatest difficulty in defining and coding. In general it consists of areas of instruction important to the theological enterprise but not essential parts of it. The instruction would be carried out in the same way on the same material in any setting, secular or religious. In many cases these are the secular scientific sides of practical courses. In others these are areas which must be covered before advanced theological work can begin. Included were: sociology of religion, psychology of religion, philosophy of religion, speech, drama, play production, learning theory, social problems, Biblical and cognate languages, other research languages, archeology, courses about non-christian religions, secular history.

Not Elsewhere Classified (N.E.C.)

Primarily credit for comprehensive essays and inter-disciplinary seminars.

All courses were assigned by title, if possible. Where this was difficult because it might overlap more than one category, I used the catalogue description to make a final judgement. Faculty were assigned on the basis of department assignments. Where these did not permit clear decisions, weight of teaching assignments and self-definition, if interviewed, were used.

The category that needs most justification is Ancillary since it can overlap with every other category except N.E.C. In all cases in which there was ambiguity of assignment I followed this rule of thumb. If the majority of available evidence indicated stress on the technical or secular aspects, then I coded ancillary. If some aspect of theological scholarship was stressed I coded appropriately. Example of difficult assignments are Biblical language courses and certain social ethics courses. If a Biblical language course stressed development of vocabulary, mastery of grammar, or reading speed and did not emphasize Biblical exegesis or exposition, then I coded ancillary. If the course was primarily Biblical exegesis or exposition but in an original language with the assumption that basic linguistic work had been done, I coded Bible.

Certain social ethics courses accent statistical information about society and the accumulation and interpretation of sociological data. I see these enterprises as prolegomena to the business of ethics which accents normative judgements. Thus the former type courses were coded ancillary. Where normative judgements were stressed, they were coded Theology.

Assignment of faculty was done in a similar fashion. If a man taught languages without any other specialty, he was coded ancillary. If he taught Biblical exegesis as well as Biblical languages, he was coded Bible. In the other case, if a man's task was to develop

social data or methods of social science research, then he was ancillary. If he used data prepared by others as a base for normative judgements, then he was Theology.

Another persistent problem area was the distinction between Theology and History. This was especially true for the history of doctrine or historical theology. If the accent is on the past, on the historical development of the material, then it is History. If the accent is on the content of the material and the history is less important than current interpretation of content, it is Theology.

In general Church History can overlap with all others since one can give a history of anything. Where this occurred, e.g. history of liturgy, an attempt was made to discover the emphasis. If on history, then code History; if on current understanding of the content, then code according to content.

In preliminary tests of the coding scheme, before research was begun, inter-coder reliability was 88 to 95%. This seemed adequate.

I realize that any coding scheme is a set of judgments about theological education. Many will disagree with the judgements I have made. On the whole, however, this scheme will be acceptable to more people than any other with the same number of categories.

In particular I am pleased with the insight gained from the development of the ancillary category. It is evident that much teaching is done in this category. In many cases subject matter in this category has an old and respected place in theological education, e.g. Biblical languages. What the category emphasizes is that many subjects, e.g. Biblical languages, are taught in a seminary primarily because they are not taught many other places. When a substantial proportion of the student body is deficient in a subject that is considered an essential prerequisite for theological study, that subject is incorporated in the curriculum. Thus Hebrew, Latin and Greek move into theological curricula when they are no longer required or taught at the undergraduate level.

The list on the following page was taken from Paul Harrison's study (p. 40). In absence of other information about the courses I would have coded the material this way (numbers indicate Harrison's categories):

Bible	1-4, 24
Church History	6-15, 26
Theology	16-23, 28-30
Practical	34, 38-42
Ancillary	25, 27, 31-33, 35-37, 43-48

Categories for Curricula Analysis
From Paul M. Harrison, CURRICULA ANALYSIS

1. Bible
2. Graeco-Roman & Near East
3. Old Testament
4. New Testament
5. History & Theology
6. Christianity, 100-500 A.D.
7. Medieval, 500-1500
8. Orthodoxy, 1000-1970
9. Reformation & Post-Reformation
10. Special Studies (5-9)
11. American Christianity, 1600-1970
12. Modern
13. Protestant
14. Catholic
15. Missions
16. Contemporary
17. Protestant
18. Catholic
19. Dogmatic & Creedal Theology
20. Denominational
21. Catholic
23. Systematic Theology
24. Hermeneutics, etc.
25. Philosophy of Religion
26. Ecumenical
27. Post-Biblical Judaism
28. Ethics & Society
29. Theological Ethics
30. Social Ethics
31. Sociology of Religion
32. Religion & Personality
33. Psychology of Religion
34. Pastoral Counselling, etc.
35. Contemporary Culture
36. Art, Literature, Drama
37. Science, Technology, etc.
38. Practical Theology
39. Preaching, etc.
40. Religious Education
41. Nature of Church & Ministry
42. Polity
43. History of Religions
44. China
45. India
46. Japan
47. North Africa
48. Sub-Sahara